REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 131-200 are currently pending in the application. Claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 are in independent form. The listing of claims herein replaces all previous listing of claims. No new claims are added.

In the Final Office Action mailed May 25, 2010, the Examiner rejected Claims 131, 133-137, and 143-200 under 35 U.S.C. §103(c) as being unpatentable over Yacoub (U.S. Pat. No. 6,452,692) in view of Sugahara (U.S. Pat. No. 7,593,123). The Examiner further rejected Claims 132 and 138-142 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacoub in view of Sugahara and in further view of Stewart (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0057075).

For at least the following reasons, Applicants traverse the Examiner's §103 rejections. More specifically, Applicants have articulated their response as an element-by-element discussion of at least multiple elements Applicants assert are patentable over the cited prior art.

1. ... **receiving from the information apparatus at the one or more servers a security or authentication information associated with the user operating the information apparatus for authentication of the user. . .**

Applicants have amended claim 131 to add the above element. Support for the above-recited element can be found for example at least in paragraphs [0132], [0133], and [0134] of the as-filed specification.

The Examiner states that neither Yacoub nor Sugahara teaches receiving authentication information from an information apparatus at the server. The

Examiner alleges, however, that Stewart paragraphs [0018] and [0046] teach receiving authentication information from an information apparatus at the server:

[0018] In yet another embodiment of the invention, there is a system for delivering a document over a network. The system includes, for example, an interface on a client to download a print driver from the network, the print driver creating a print file from the document, an authentication manager to verify that the print driver is valid by comparing predetermined information with components of the print driver stored in the print file.

[0046] A caching server 340 manages the download of driver software and other common HTML and image data elements between the client 310 and the UPJA 320. The UPJA 320 (which is a server in the preferred embodiment and therefore includes the conventional components of a computer, including memory, storage and a process), in one embodiment, receives the document as it is transmitted from the client 310, via the ISP 312, across the network 300. The document is received by the UPJA 320, via the upload manager 310c, after the print driver 310b being used has been authenticated by the version manager 348, and the entire document has been sent to the port monitor 346. Replicating servers 350 (i.e. lightweight directory assistance protocol, or LDAP, servers) authenticate clients 310 requesting services from the UPJA 320 and web servers 315...

As shown above, Stewart does not teach nor describe "receiving from the information apparatus at the one or more servers a security or authentication

information associated with the user operating the information apparatus for authentication of the user" as recited in claim 131. Instead, Stewart emphasizes the teaching of <u>authentication of the printer driver</u> running at the client 310 by an authentication manager ". . . *by comparing predetermined information with components of the print driver stored in the print file.*" Nothing in Stewart teaches authentication of the user by sending authentication information associated with the user from the information apparatus to the server.

Following Stewart, one skilled in the art will be lead to authenticate the printer driver by comparing the information stored in the print file generated by the printer driver and not to authenticate the user by receiving authentication information associated with the user.

Because of the explicit teaching by Stewart to authenticate the printer driver and not the user, Stewart cannot be combined with any other reference including Yacoub and/or Sugahara to describe authentication of the user.

Independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 each recite at least an element analogous to "receiving from the information apparatus at the one or more servers a security or authentication information associated with the user operating the information apparatus for authentication of the user." This element alone is sufficient to distinguish independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 from all cited references. Accordingly, for at least the reasons offered above with respect to currently amended independent claim 131, Applicants assert that currently amended independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 are patentable. All dependent claims depending from

independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 are patentable at least based on their dependency from patentable independent claims.

2. . . . **receiving at the one or more servers an output device object from the mobile information apparatus over a network, the output device object having one or more attributes corresponding to the output device, including an indication of a language and or data format that is acceptable as input to the output device for rendering. . .**

Applicants have further amended claim 131 to add the above element.

The Examiner states that neither Yacoub nor Stewart teaches "an output device object" and "the output device object including an indication of a language and or data format that is acceptable as input to the output device for rendering". However, the Examiner alleges that Sugahara column 1 lines 42-65 teach an apparatus in which one such attribute is the language wherein the printing device are categorized by language group. The portion of Sugahara cited by the Examiner is provided below:

In consideration of such a problem, it is an object of the present invention to provide a printing system capable of carrying out a printing operation without waiting for a while even if printing jobs are concentrated in a printer.

The present invention provides a printing system in which a plurality of printing devices are connected to each other through a network line and printing job data transmitted from a data processing device is received by the printing devices to carry out a printing operation, the printing system comprising at least printing means for causing the printing devices to

22

execute a printing operation based on the printing job data,
communicating means for transmitting and receiving data together with
the other printing devices and storing means for storing device
information of the other printing devices, wherein the printing devices are
formed into groups based on a processable language, one of the printing
devices belonging to the same language group is caused to act as a
managing printing device, device information of all the printing devices
belonging to a language group which can be processed by the managing
printing device are stored, and job data is transferred to the other printing
devices belonging to the same language group when the job data is
transferred from any of the printing devices.

Applicants assert that Sugahara teaches a method to speed up a printing job by a printer using a plurality of printers. More specifically, Sugahara describes that a plurality of printers can be grouped based on a processed language group and that one of the printers in the group can act as the managing printer by passing the job data to other printers in the group for processing.

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Sugahara teaches anything akin to "receiving at the one or more servers an output device object from the information apparatus over a network." First, Sugahara does not teach anything akin to an object. Second, Sugahara does not teach receiving at a server an output device object. Instead Sugahara explicitly teaches that a printing device (managing printer) -- not an information apparatus -- sends the print job to other

23

printers in the language group. And third, a printer (whether the managing printer or other printers) – not a server – receives the print job.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Sugahara teaches or describes "the output device object having one or more attributes corresponding to the output device, including an indication of a language and or data format that is acceptable as input to the output device for rendering." Again, Sugahara does not describe anything akin to an output device object. Sugahara further cannot teach receiving an output device object at a server from an information apparatus. And Sugahara further cannot teach that the output device object received from the information apparatus at the server "includes one or more attributes corresponding to the output device, including an indication of a language and or data format."

Independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 each recite at least an element analogous to "receiving at the one or more servers an output device object from the mobile information apparatus over a network, the output device object having one or more attributes corresponding to the output device, including an indication of a language and or data format that is acceptable as input to the output device for rendering." This element alone is sufficient to distinguish independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 from all cited references. Accordingly, for at least the reasons offered above, Applicants assert that currently amended independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 are patentable. All dependent claims depending from independent

claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 are patentable at least based on their dependency from patentable independent claims.

3. . . . **generating device dependent output data at the server with a server application, the device dependent output data being associated with the output content and related at least in part to the indication of a language or a data format included in the output device object received from the information apparatus for rendering the output content. . .**

Applicants have further amended claim 131 to add the above element.

The Examiner states that neither Yacoub nor Stewart teaches "an output device object" and "the output device object including an indication of a language and or data format that is acceptable as input to the output device for rendering." However, the Examiner alleges that Sugahara column 1 lines 42-65 teach an apparatus in which one such attribute is the language wherein the printing device are categorized by language group.

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Sugahara teaches or describes anything akin to "generating device dependent output data at the server . . . the device dependent output data being . . . related at least in part to the indication of a language or a data format included in the output device object received from the information apparatus." Simply put, Sugahara is not even in the proper field of endeavor to solve the problem of "generating device dependent output data at the server." Instead, Sugahara teaches something else entirely, namely "an . . . invention to provide a printing system capable of carrying out a printing operation without waiting for a while even if printing jobs are concentrated in a printer."

Applicants submit that the only thing in Sugahara that can be mapped to the above element recited in currently amended claim 131 is the one word "language" and nothing else. Sugahara does not teach nor suggest anything to one of ordinary skill in the art relative to the element recited above. Accordingly, Applicants assert that Sugahara cannot be combined with any other reference including Yacoub and Stewart to teach "generating device dependent output data at the server with a server application, the device dependent output data being associated with the output content and related at least in part to the indication of a language or a data format included in the output device object received from the information apparatus."

Independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 each recite at least an element analogous to "generating device dependent output data at the server with a server application, the device dependent output data being associated with the output content and related at least in part to the indication of a language or a data format included in the output device object received from the information apparatus for rendering the output content." This element alone is sufficient to distinguish independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 from all cited references. Accordingly, for at least the reasons offered above, Applicants assert that currently amended independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 are patentable. All dependent claims depending from independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 are patentable at least based on their dependency from patentable independent claims.

CONCLUSION

In addition to the three distinctions described above, independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 further recite one or more elements not explicitly discussed by the Applicants. For example claim 167 recites "the document object including a pointer or reference to the output content for the one or more servers to retrieve the data content from a content server with the pointer or reference," which is not taught or described by Yacoub, Sugahara, and/or Stewart. Applicants respectfully assert that the additional distinctions over the cited references taken either alone or in combination shall be apparent after a reading of the listing of amended claims included herewith.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims of the application as amended. For at least the foregoing distinctions outlined above, the Applicants respectfully assert that currently amended independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 are patentable as each recites at least an element not taught or suggested by Yacoub, Sugahara, and Stewart, taken either alone or in combination. All dependent claims depending from independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 are patentable at least for depending from a patentable independent claim.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (360) 750-9931 if it appears that an additional interview would be helpful in advancing the case. The Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of the pending claims

must be withdrawn, and that this application is in condition for allowance. Such is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jon C. Reali/

JON C. REALI
USPTO Reg. No. 54,391

RYLANDER & ASSOCIATES PC
406 West 12th Street
Vancouver, Washington 98660
(360) 750-9931